PATENT

I hereby certify that on the date specified below, this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

March 1, 2007
Date

Jennifer Badley
Jennifer Badley

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Applicants | : | W. Daniel Hillis et al. |
| Application No. | : | 10/764,340 |
| Filed | : | January 21, 2004 |
| Title | : | IMAGE CORRECTION USING A MICROLENS ARRAY AS A UNIT |
| Confirmation No. | : | 5765 |
| Examiner | : | Martinez, Joseph P. |
| Art Unit | : | 2873 |
| Docket No. | : | 0803-001-004-000000 |
| Customer No. | : | 44,765 |

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

AND AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents:

This paper is responsive to the Final Office action dated 01 November 2006 ("Office action"), having a shortened statutory period expiring 01 February 2007. Accompanying this response is a petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extension of time by one (1) month setting a new time for response of 01 March 2007. Further examination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks set forth below.

**Interview Summary** begins on page 2.

**Amendments to the claims begin** on page 3

## INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On or around 27 February 2007, the undersigned communicated with Examiner Martinez (hereinafter "Examiner") by phone regarding text that Examiner used in support of his non-statutory double-patenting rejections. Specifically, the undersigned asked Examiner for clarification of the text reciting "... claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,967,780 to inherently include ...," that the Examiner used in conjunction with his non-statutory double-patenting rejections of "Claims 31 and 33-35." *See Examiner's Final Office Action* pp. 3-4 (01 November 2006).

In the course of this communication, Examiner clarified for the undersigned that Examiner intended to use the foregoing-cited text as a shorthand indication that Examiner saw the objected to claims as more-or-less obvious extensions of the subject matter of "claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,967,780," which was why Examiner was requesting the terminal disclaimer. Examiner clarified that he did NOT mean to imply any limitation on the scope of "claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,967,780," and that his remarks were in no way directed toward "claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,967,780"; rather, his remarks were intended to go toward an explanation of the basis on which he was making his non-statutory double-patenting rejections of then-pending "Claims 31 and 33-35" in view of "claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,967,780". The undersigned thanked and thanks Examiner for this clarification.